

FOREIGN POLICY REPORTS

August 15, 1941

Social and Political Changes in Wartime Britain

BY JAMES FREDERICK GREEN

PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH BY THE

Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated

MIDSTON HOUSE, 22 EAST 38th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOLUME XVII NUMBER 11 25¢ a copy \$5.00 a year

Social and Political Changes in Wartime Britain

BY JAMES FREDERICK GREEN

BRITAIN'S military effort and economic mobilization have imposed a far heavier strain on the civilian population than in the World War and have severely tested historic political and social institutions.¹ The impact of total war upon British life offers many lessons for the United States and other democracies where the national economy is being transformed from a peacetime to a wartime basis. While it is yet impossible to predict the ultimate trends in British social and political development, this REPORT analyzes some of the most important changes that have accompanied Britain's construction of a wartime economy.

EMERGENCY MEASURES

One of the most notable phenomena of Britain's transformation into an "island fortress" has been the continuance and expansion of social welfare measures.² In many fields of social security legislation, Great Britain—like the Scandinavian countries—has been almost a generation ahead of the United States. Because this conflict, to a far greater extent than the World War, has placed the civilian in the "front line," Britain has had to regard the health and comfort of those who were formerly "non-combatants" as vital a wartime consideration as the welfare of men in the armed forces. While evacuation of children from London, air raid precautions, and aid to air raid victims have been the most pressing issues before the Government, the reinforcement of the whole structure of social security—including pensions, injury allowances, un-

employment insurance and assistance, and health insurance—has been of almost equal importance.

Britain's preparations to meet air raids and perhaps invasion provide for the decentralization of authority in event of emergency and the severance of communications. The country was divided in the spring of 1939 into twelve regions and placed under the direction of commissioners, who were delegated complete authority over the population in case the area became isolated from the central administration.³ The regional commissioners are responsible for the Civil Defense and Air Raid Precautions work in their area, and have undertaken increasingly heavy duties as the war progresses. Around them have grown up "miniature Whitehalls," where divisional officers carry out the work of most of the Government departments. These commissioners constitute a novel departure from the traditional British divisions of authority between town, county and nation. The existence of innumerable local authorities—often with overlapping powers and without coordination, even in such essential matters as fire-fighting equipment—has in many instances dangerously hampered the civil defense program. As the London raids progressed, the central government was compelled to exert an overriding authority. In October 1940 the three commissioners for the London region were supplemented by two commissioners for special purposes, one for rehousing of homeless persons and the other for clearance and salvage of debris.⁴ In May 1941, moreover, legislation was passed reorganizing Britain's 1,400 fire brigades into less than 50 regiments under a general staff officer.⁵

The dispersal of the civilian population from dangerous areas has created many formidable social problems.⁶ Although the number of evacuees fluctuates

1. This is the second of two *Foreign Policy Reports* on wartime changes in Great Britain. The first, published on August 1, 1941, was entitled "Britain's Wartime Economy, 1940-41."

2. For a brief summary, see *Britain's Social Services in War-Time* (New York, British Library of Information, 1941). Among the many general works on Britain under wartime conditions, the following are outstanding: Ben Robertson, *I Saw England* (New York, Knopf, 1941); Richie Calder, *Carry on London* (London, English University Press, 1941); Ralph Ingersoll, *Report on England: November 1940* (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1940); Edward R. Murrow, *This is London* (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1941); Quentin Reynolds, *The Wounded Don't Cry* (New York, Dutton, 1941); Mollie Panter-Downes, *Letter From England* (Boston, Little, Brown, 1940); Allan Nevins, "This Is England Today," *The New York Sun*, July 28, August 2, 1941.

3. *Regionaliter*, "The Regional Commissioners," *The Political Quarterly*, April-June 1941, pp. 144-53; Kenneth Lindsay, "Regional Defence," *The Times*, March 24 and 25, 1941.

4. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, October 16, 1941, vol. 365, no. 116, cols. 695-96.

5. Fire Services (Emergency Provisions) Bill, 1941.

6. "The Problems of Evacuation," British Library of Information, July 2, 1941, typewritten; Calder, *Carry on London*, cited.

FOREIGN POLICY REPORTS, VOLUME XVII, NUMBER II, AUGUST 15, 1941

Published twice a month by the FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, Incorporated, 22 East 38th Street, New York, N. Y., U.S.A. FRANK ROSS MCCOY, President; WILLIAM T. STONE, Vice President and Washington representative; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor and Research Director; HELEN TERRY, Assistant Editor. Research Associates: T. A. BISSON, A. RANDLE ELLIOTT, LOUIS E. FRECHTLING, JAMES FREDERICK GREEN, HELEN H. MOORHEAD, DAVID H. POPPER, ONA K. D. RINGWOOD, JOHN C. DEWILDE. Subscription Rates: \$5.00 a year; to F.P.A. members \$3.00; single copies 25 cents. Entered as second-class matter on March 31, 1931 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

tuates between periods of emergency and relative quiet, an average of about 1,500,000 persons have been living away from their pre-war homes. In the first four days of September 1939 approximately 1,317,000 persons—primarily school children and teachers, mothers with children under school age, pregnant women, and the crippled and blind—were evacuated from the larger cities in accordance with carefully prepared plans. Evacuation remained on a wholly voluntary basis until December 1940, when the Ministry of Health ordered that any child under 14 in Greater London believed to be suffering in mind or body from enemy action could be required to leave. In addition to those evacuated under Government direction, many others made private arrangements to leave, and numerous government departments and business firms transferred their offices to rural areas.

Innumerable hardships and difficulties have arisen from the settlement of so many women and children in strange surroundings, the mutual lack of understanding between town and country people, indiscipline and uncleanness of the slum children, disruption of educational facilities, and lack of social and recreational facilities in most rural villages. By January 1941, however, there had been established in the reception areas 518 social centers, 265 communal feeding centers, 443 occupational clubs, 501 hostels for difficult children, and 475 hostels for families and special groups. At that time, moreover, 81.7 per cent of the children in evacuation areas were receiving full-time instruction in elementary schools.

In their original preparations for air raids the authorities in most cities failed—largely through lack of experience—to realize the scope of the problem or to master many of the essential details. The Chamberlain government consistently opposed a "deep shelter" policy and failed to prepare for sustenance of the civil population, owing both to the complex technical issues involved and to its belief and hope that war would not occur. It favored, moreover, a policy of evacuation and dispersal of the population. After the inadequacy of the air raid precaution system in London was revealed during the raids of August and September 1940, a storm of protest compelled the Government to make improvements in the shelters, community feeding canteens, information and rest centers, and provision for temporary housing.⁷ The Government, depending too heavily upon the experience of the poorly defended Spanish cities during the civil war and underestimating the ability of

its own defenses to keep enemy planes at great heights, anticipated many deaths and injuries rather than general dislocation of civilian life. While civilian casualties have been relatively small, considering the scope and duration of the raids—41,488 dead and 53,498 wounded on June 30, 1941⁸—the families whose homes and entire possessions were instantaneously destroyed created the most serious problem.

Provision was made for immediate compensation in such cases, for households with an income under £400, and for loss of clothing for an applicant with an income of less than £250, or £400 if he has dependents.⁹ Similar compensation was to be made for loss of a workman's tools or a small retailer's goods. Government and private agencies cooperated also in arranging for immediate financial assistance to raid victims, travel and housing, and other emergency aid.

Outstanding among the many different emergency agencies that have developed, usually through cooperation between government departments and private charities, have been the community feeding organizations, including mobile canteens, catering establishments in air raid shelters, and municipal institutions now known as "British Restaurants."¹⁰ Steadily growing fleets of mobile kitchens are in use for heavily raided areas, while in London nearly 1900 public shelters now have feeding arrangements for 200,000 persons nightly. The Ministry of Food, in cooperation with municipal authorities, is rapidly increasing the number of communal restaurants which provide meals for only 6d. Similar arrangements have been worked out for many evacuation centers, factories and schools.

Despite the rapid growth of civil defense organizations, fire-fighting brigades, first-aid and other groups, and their efficient performance during emergency, many localities were understaffed under these purely voluntary arrangements. A special measure, Defense Regulation 26A, authorized the Home Secretary to register all British subjects of either sex for civil defense duties in a specific area, to apply this regulation where volunteers are insufficient, and to enroll the registrants for compulsory part-time duty.¹¹ Under this Regulation, any person between 16 and 60 years of age

8. Thirteen months ending June 30, 1941. *New York Herald Tribune*, July 15, 1941. Casualties in the armed forces amounted to 37,607 killed and missing and 25,895 wounded on March 31, 1941.

9. *Britain's Social Services in Wartime*, cited, p. 3.

10. "Public Feeding," British Library of Information, no date, typewritten; H. N. Brailsford, "Communal Meals," *The New Statesman and Nation*, December 28, 1940, p. 672.

11. *Defence Regulations* (London, H.M. Stationery Office, 7th edition, January 15, 1941), pp. 64-65.

7. See, for example, the articles on air raids by Mr. Richie Calder, *The New Statesman and Nation*, September 14, 1940, pp. 252-53; September 21, 1940, pp. 276-78; October 19, 1940, pp. 371-73; November 2, 1940, pp. 436-37.

can be required to serve 48 hours in any month on civil defense duty, except for exemption—subject to appeal—on medical grounds or in cases of “exceptional hardship.” The extent to which this Regulation has been employed has not been disclosed, owing to the danger of revealing military secrets.¹² This measure was later supplemented by the National Service Act, authorizing registration of the entire adult population for civil defense work.¹³

The effort to safeguard the civilian population has affected the whole schedule of allowances and pensions for the families of men in the armed forces. These arrangements now comprise not merely the traditional fighting services, but also merchant marine workers and fishermen, Civil Defense Volunteers, the Home Guard, and the whole adult civilian population.¹⁴ The allowances for the dependents of men in the fighting services similar to World War arrangements were considerably increased in October 1940, to correspond with the rise in cost of living.¹⁵ Men in the merchant marine and fishing trade receive allowances and pensions on the Royal Navy scale. Members of the Home Guard receive the compensation rates of a private soldier when on duty, or of a civilian when off duty. The original scheme for allowances and pensions to both members of the civil defense forces and gainfully employed persons was extended in April 1941 to include “war injuries” suffered by any person over 15 years of age.¹⁶ The schedule of injury allowances and pensions in event of complete disablement include a maximum allowance of 35s. weekly for men and 28s. for women.

SOCIAL SERVICES

The war has brought improvements, furthermore, in each of the four major categories of Britain's social security program: health insurance, contributory pensions scheme, workmen's compensation acts and unemployment insurance. The Health Insurance Scheme, established in 1912, provides compulsory insurance for 20,000,000 persons between 14 and 65 years of age employed in manual labor, or engaged in non-manual work and earning less than £250 annually; it provides free medi-

cal treatment and medicine, weekly cash payments in event work is prevented by sickness, and maternity benefits. This plan was expanded in May 1941 to include approximately 500,000 non-manual workers earning between £250 and £420 annually.¹⁷ The old age, widows' and orphans' pensions scheme, established in 1926, covers those persons included in the health insurance plan, providing pensions for men of 65—and, as amended in February 1940—to women of 60, with new provisions for supplementary pensions in case of need.¹⁸ Benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Acts, dating from 1906, were expanded in August 1940, increasing the cost by 30 per cent, or £9,000,000.¹⁹

The most important wartime changes have taken place in the unemployment insurance and assistance schemes, covering about 16,000,000 persons. This program, like health insurance, was expanded in July 1940 to include white-collar workers earning between £250 and £420 annually.²⁰ The benefits for men over 20 were increased from 17s. to £1 weekly; and for women, from 15s. to 18s. weekly, with proportionate increases for youths. The exceedingly unpopular “household means test,” by which the resources of an entire household were aggregated in calculating the need of an applicant for a supplementary assistance benefit, was abolished early in 1941.²¹ The household means test, which the Labor party had opposed ever since its enactment in 1934, imposed an unfair burden on members of a household, placed the applicant for benefit in a humiliating position, and required excessively detailed inquiries among the household and employers. In its place the Government provided that only the resources of the applicant's family should be considered, and relaxed many of the more rigid provisions regarding the system.

A further aspect of Britain's wartime program for social security involves nutrition, which has become increasingly important because of shipping shortages. A pre-war program for providing free or inexpensive milk to school children, young

12. Mr. Herbert Morrison, Minister of Home Security, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 26, 1941.

13. Green, “Britain's War Economy, 1940-41,” cited, p. 132.

14. Ministry of Pensions, No. 4, March 7, 1941. For survey, see “The Compensation of War Victims: Great Britain,” *International Labour Review*, March 1940, pp. 276-91.

15. Mr. Anthony Eden, War Secretary, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, October 10, 1941, vol. 365, no. 113, cols. 370-72.

16. “Personal Injuries (Civilians) Scheme, 1941, dated April 10, 1941,” *Statutory Rules and Orders*, 1941, No. 226.

17. National Health Insurance, Contributing Pensions and Workmen's Compensation Bill, 1941; “Report by the Government Actuary on the Financial Provisions of Part I of the Bill,” Cmd. 6290. The new provisions will not take effect, however, until January 1942.

18. Old Age and Widows' Pensions Act, 1940, *Public General Acts*, 1939-40, 3 & 4 Geo. 6, ch. 13.

19. Workmen's Compensation (Supplementary Allowances) Act, 1940, *ibid.*, ch. 47.

20. Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940, *ibid.*, ch. 44.

21. Determination of Needs Act, 1941, *Public General Acts*, 1940-41, 4 & 5 Geo. 6, ch. 11; for interpretation, see “Old Age and Widows' Pensions Act, 1940, and Determination of Needs Act, 1941. Explanatory Memorandum. . .,” Cmd. 6265, 1941. For discussion, see A. D. K. Owen, “The End of the Household Means Test in Great Britain,” *International Labour Review*, June 1941, pp. 627-44.

children, and pregnant or nursing mothers has been continued in wartime. While the price of milk increased to 4½d. per pint, young children and mothers could obtain one pint a day at 2d., and families with incomes not exceeding 40s. (plus 6s. for each dependent) could obtain milk free. About 2.5 million persons have been benefiting from this arrangement, which was given more permanent status in April 1941, in addition to widespread consumption of milk in the schools.²²

As the war has progressed, demand has arisen for a more coherent program of social security, on the basis of a "national minimum," with special provision for children.²³ Because allowances for children are contained in many different social security schemes, but varying considerably in amount, it is argued that a general allowance of 5s. weekly for every child in the United Kingdom—costing about £118,000,000 yearly additional money—or for every child after the first—at a cost of £55,000,000—would offer a more equitable basis for safeguarding the civilian population and maintaining national morale. A resolution for such a scheme has been signed in the House of Commons by 70 Conservatives, 50 Laborites, 10 Liberals, and 5 Independents.²⁴

INSURANCE OF PROPERTY

Because of the widespread damage from air raids, bringing ruin to individuals and business concerns in many sections of the country, the Government in December 1940—despite rejection of the principle by the Chamberlain government in October 1939—launched a gigantic plan for the compulsory insurance of all property in the United Kingdom.²⁵ The War Damage Act illustrates the "island fortress" type of economy more effectively than any other single piece of legislation, for it spreads the risk of air raids throughout the entire country and compels relatively safe areas to contribute to the reconstruction of heavily bombed communities. The measure supplements previous legislation providing for the insurance of ships, cargoes and other goods.²⁶

The War Damage Act embodies three different, but closely related, programs: compulsory insurance of buildings and other immovable property;

compulsory insurance of goods; and voluntary insurance of personal chattels. Under the first section, compulsory contributions (rather than premiums, since no actuarial basis for the scheme is possible) are required from each of the approximately 13,000,000 pieces of property in Britain, with the exception of churches, hospitals, and almshouses.²⁷ The amount of contribution is fixed at 2s. in the £ for five years of the "full annual value" of the property as ascertained for purposes of assessment under Schedule A of the income tax or of valuation for local rating lists. (The contribution, in other words, is 10 per cent of the taxable annual income from, not the capital value of, a piece of property for the next five years.) The total yield of these contributions is estimated at £200,000,000. If the compensation exceeds this amount, the Exchequer will meet the deficiency up to an additional £200,000,000; if the compensation exceeds £400,000,000, one-half of the excess will be provided by the Exchequer and one-half by an increase in the rate of contribution.

In return for these contributions, the Government undertakes to repair all air raid damage or to replace all destroyed property for the two year period, September 1, 1939 to August 31, 1941. In event of damage, compensation is made for the "cost of works" whenever labor and material are available for repairs, or immediately in case of urgency. In the case of total loss, the owner will receive full value for the property as of March 31, 1939. If either the cost of works or the value payment is postponed until after the war, interest at 2½ per cent is paid on the sum due the owner.

The second part of this far-reaching measure provides for the insurance of movable plant and machinery, as well as fittings and equipment used for business purposes. Insurance is compulsory for goods over £1,000 in value, and optional otherwise. The contribution is fixed at 10s. per £100, payment to be spread over three years. As in the case of the building insurance, compensation covers all damage during the first two years of the war. The third section, purely voluntary in scope, offers a one-year insurance policy on all furniture, clothes, and other private effects of an individual, up to a limit of £1,500, with an additional allowance of £500 for car or motorcycle.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

As in the World War, many discussions have begun regarding the post-war social structure of

27. Charitable institutions for advancement of education, science, or research are charged one-third the normal rate. Contribution from agricultural properties is placed at 6d. in the £, or 2½ per cent of the annual value. Omitted from the scheme are public utilities, railways, docks, gas, water and electricity works, which will be covered in a separate undertaking.

22. Milk (National Scheme) Order, 1941.

23. Eleanor Rathbone, *Family Allowances in War-Time* (New York, Penguin Books, 1940).

24. *The New Statesman and Nation*, May 3, 1941.

25. War Damage Act, 1941, *Public General Acts*, 1940-41, 4 & 5 Geo. 6, ch. 12. For analysis of the Act, see the address of Sir Kingsley Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, December 17, 1941, vol. 367, no. 11, cols. 1069-1122.

26. War Risks Insurance Act, 1939, *Public General Acts*, 1938-1939, 2 & 3 Geo. 6, ch. 57.

Great Britain.²⁸ Because of the devastation caused by air raids in many of Britain's largest cities, many Britons envisage a physical reconstruction of gigantic scope.²⁹ Architects, city planners and ordinary citizens, recalling that the Great Fire of London in 1666 led to the wholesale rebuilding of the city under the direction of Sir Christopher Wren—whose many churches in turn were destroyed by the fires of 1940 and 1941—realize that an unparalleled opportunity exists for reorganizing whole communities. To prepare for the problems ahead, as well as to meet the immediate exigencies of air raids, the Churchill government in October 1940 established a Ministry of Works and Buildings, headed by Lord Reith. The manifold functions of the Ministry include responsibility for all new civil works required by Government departments and previously controlled by the Office of Works; to license all private buildings; to participate in the formulation of building priorities in the Production Council; to control and purchase building materials; and to deal with the whole issue of post-war reconstruction of town and country.³⁰ The broader problems of post-war planning are under the jurisdiction of a committee headed by Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Deputy Leader of the Labor party and Minister without Portfolio in the War Cabinet, but no reports are available regarding its activities.

With the development of national unity and expansion of social legislation that have occurred during the past year, considerable discussion has taken place in Great Britain regarding the implications of these trends for the future. Virtually every observer of the British scene, especially American journalists, agree that a rapid process of democratization has been under way, modifying to some extent the traditional class structure and reducing the gap between the privileged and underprivileged sections of society. The suffering and hardship resulting from air raids and evacuation have revived much of the "community spirit" that has been lacking in Britain and other industrial countries. They have not only exposed to public view many of the slum conditions and inadequate nutrition and hygiene existing in the large cities, but have created widespread demand for remedial

action and for greater "equality of opportunity" in the post-war period.

The rapidly mounting burden of taxation, moreover, has undoubtedly not only prevented the creation of wartime millionaires but stringently limited the income available to the middle and upper classes. According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for example, enjoyment of a tax-free income of £5,000 (about \$20,000) would require a gross income of £66,000 (about \$264,000).³¹ Since the combined income tax and surtax amount to 97½ per cent on the highest incomes, an effective ceiling is placed on the money any individual can enjoy, as indicated in the following table:

BRITAIN'S WARTIME INCOME TAX*

Total Income	Income Tax and Surtax	Postwar Credit
SINGLE PERSON		
£120 (\$480)	£7 10s. (\$30.00)	£7 10s. (\$30.00)
£500 (\$2,000)	£156 2s. (\$624.40)	£26 13s. (\$106.60)
£1,000 (\$4,000)	£381 2s. (\$1,524.40)	£43 6s. (\$173.20)
£5,000 (\$20,000)	£2,837 7s. (\$11,349.40)	£60 0s. (\$240)
£10,000 (\$40,000)	£6,862 7s. (\$27,449.40)	£60 0s. (\$240)
£100,000 (\$400,000)	£94,174 17s. (\$376,699.40)	£60 0s. (\$240)
MARRIED COUPLE WITH TWO CHILDREN		
£270 (\$1,080)	£0 19s. (\$3.80)	£0 19s. (\$3.80)
£500 (\$2,000)	£76 2s. (\$304.40)	£28 9s. (\$113.80)
£1,000 (\$4,000)	£301 2s. (\$1,204.40)	£48 6s. (\$193.20)
£5,000 (\$20,000)	£2,757 7s. (\$11,029.40)	£65 0s. (\$260)
£10,000 (\$40,000)	£6,782 7s. (\$27,129.40)	£65 0s. (\$260)
£100,000 (\$400,000)	£94,094 17s. (\$376,379.40)	£65 0s. (\$260)

**The Times*, April 8, 1941. Tax payable after deduction of personal allowance and earned income relief. Individual taxpayers may be eligible for further reliefs that would somewhat reduce the total tax payable.

At the same time that a wartime ceiling has been placed over the higher income brackets, a floor of social security benefits has been placed beneath the poorest portions of the nation. Even though

28. For a series of articles published in the weekly magazine *Picture Post* (London), see *A Plan for Britain* (Washington, National Economic and Social Planning Association, Planning Pamphlets No. 3, February 1941).

29. "Problems of Reconstruction. I. Building," *The Round Table*, March 1941, pp. 279-95; Thomas Sharp, "Planning for Reconstruction," *The Political Quarterly*, April-June 1941, pp. 134-43.

30. Mr. Ernest G. Hicks, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works and Buildings, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 19, 1941, vol. 370, no. 39, col. 171.

31. *The Times*, April 8, 1941. For survey of recent fiscal policy, see Green, "Britain's War Economy, 1940-41," cited, pp. 134-35.

the differences in income and in purchasing power between various levels of society have been reduced through taxation and rationing, there has apparently been little redistribution of capital wealth and the sources of income. If the war were to end in the near future, in other words, the rich and poor would probably return to the *status quo ante bellum*, however modified by taxation and general readjustment in the post-war period.

Several developments since the outbreak of war have indicated the trend toward greater social equality. In July 1938 the War Office, then headed by Mr. Leslie Hore-Belisha, had opened the higher posts of the Army to persons of every class by requiring that service in the ranks must precede promotion to officers' positions.³² A similar democratization was ordered in the Foreign Service on June 11, 1941, when Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden announced to the consular and diplomatic services, that salary increases would make a private income less necessary than in the past, and that women would be eligible for promotion to the highest posts.³³ That the "old school tie" may have less influence in the future is suggested by the straitened circumstances of many of the great "public" schools, owing to evacuation and the burden of taxation on the upper and middle classes. The prevailing trend of opinion throughout both left-wing and right-wing circles seems to indicate a recognition of the need for large-scale transformations in British economic and social life, but without regard to dogmas of any kind, or the extremes of laissez-faire capitalism or doctrinaire socialism.³⁴ Many political writers have been advocating a more dynamic concept of community life which, while preserving individual liberty, would emphasize social relationships and the responsibilities and duties of citizenship. Typical of this attitude has been the declaration of the leaders of the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Free Churches on December 21, 1940, stressing social equality and the abolition of economic privilege, and the formation of a Catholic movement, called The Sword of the Spirit, for the carrying out of these principles.³⁵

RETENTION OF DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES

With regard to the political aspect of Britain's war effort two developments are of especial significance; the continuing vigor of Parliamentary criticism, and the retention of civil liberty and freedom of speech.³⁶ Although the Churchill gov-

ernment is armed with almost dictatorial powers, it is constantly being criticized, rebuked, and spurred to action by the House of Commons.³⁷ Public opinion is brought to bear upon the Government through both the traditional question periods and debates, and secret sessions are used for discussions involving information of value to the enemy. Attacks against the Government in the press and Parliament, while lacking the acerbity with which the previous Chamberlain régime was assailed and eventually overthrown, comprise every aspect of military affairs and the home front. Newspapers and magazines are handicapped, however, by the paper shortage which has severely limited their size.

On most votes of confidence the Churchill Cabinet is opposed by only the three Scottish members of the Independent Labor party and the sole Communist M.P., William Gallacher. In many minor votes and in general debates on policy, however, the Government encounters the opposition of several outstanding former Ministers; including David Lloyd George and Leslie Hore-Belisha, and numerous backbenchers of all parties. The formal "Opposition," eliminated by the formation of the coalition government,³⁸ is replaced by a small group of effective debaters who continue to question the Ministry, to criticize its personnel and policies, and to scrutinize its legislation. Outstanding among them are Emanuel Shinwell, Anuerin Bevan, Rhys Davies, and Philip Noel Baker, Labor; Earl Winterton and Sir Herbert Williams, Conservative; Geoffrey Mander, Clement Davies, and Sir Percy Harris, Liberal. The Government is also checked and criticized by the Select Committee on National Expenditure, composed of 32 backbenchers of all parties under the chairmanship of Sir John Wardlaw-Milne. This Select Committee investigates the defense and civil departments, visits camps and factories and holds private hearings. It has published 16 reports on government expenditures and general wartime problems and given 2 secret memoranda to the Prime Minister.

The House of Commons is hampered in its

36. For discussion of British democracy in wartime, see letter from Harold J. Laski, *The New York Times*, January 19, 1941.

37. For running commentary on the work of Parliament, see W. Ivor Jennings, "Parliament in Wartime," *The Political Quarterly*, April-June 1940, pp. 183-95; July-September 1940, pp. 232-47; October-December 1940, pp. 351-67; and January-March 1941, pp. 53-65. See also H. R. G. Greaves, "Parliament in War-time," *ibid.*, April-June 1941, pp. 202-13; July-September 1941, pp. 292-304.

38. Prime Minister Churchill in February 1941 repeated his previous offers to recognize an "Opposition" if it were formed. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, February 27, 1941, vol. 369, no. 31, col. 640. Thus far no cohesive and permanent group has come into existence, and the paid post of "Leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" has remained in abeyance since Mr. Clement Attlee joined the Government.

32. *New York Herald Tribune*, July 29, 1938.

33. *The New York Times*, June 12, 1941.

34. Geoffrey Crowther, "Is Britain Turning Socialist?" *ibid.*, March 23, 1941.

35. *Ibid.*, December 22, 1940, May 27, 1941.

normal functions, however, by the absence of many of its outstanding members on military, diplomatic and civil service duties, as well as by the preoccupation of Government leaders with administrative affairs.³⁹ On most major votes, especially in recent months, barely half the total membership of 615 has participated. So many Members of Parliament were assigned executive duties that the Government was compelled in February 1941 to introduce legislation specifically authorizing such appointments and superseding statutes dating back to the days of Queen Anne.⁴⁰ The immediate occasion for passage of the House of Commons Disqualification (Temporary Provisions) Bill, upon which Prime Minister Churchill demanded a vote of confidence, was occasioned by the appointment of Malcolm MacDonald, Minister of Health, as High Commissioner to Canada.⁴¹ Opponents of the Bill argued vainly that such appointments to overseas posts, even more than service in the armed forces, deprived constituencies of representation in the House of Commons.

PARLIAMENTARY CRITICISM

On a number of different issues public opinion, as expressed through Parliament and the press, has forced the Government to alter its policies. It has expressed dissatisfaction—with varying degrees of success—over food policy, labor supply, shelter and evacuation problems, pensions and allowances, the pace of economic mobilization, and many other questions.⁴² Among the issues raised by the House of Commons during the past year the following have been outstanding: constitutional rights under the Emergency Powers Acts; treatment of conscientious objectors; internment of enemy aliens; the B.B.C.; the anti-German broadcasts of Sir Robert Vansittart; the problem of war aims and relations with India.

Constitutional Rights. A primary function of Parliament, in war as well as in peace, is to insure as far as possible that executive and administrative officials exercise their powers in a constitutional manner, and to scrutinize both legislation and executive acts with respect to safeguarding civil liberties. Throughout the war the House of Com-

mons has debated and amended many of the Defense Regulations submitted for its approval under the Emergency Powers Acts of 1939 and 1940. The most striking example of this type of legislative supervision occurred in July 1940, after the Home Secretary, Sir John Anderson, introduced a measure providing summary punishment for certain offenses committed within any district declared by the Home Office to be a "war zone."⁴³ This Bill prompted by fear of invasion and air raids, authorized special tribunals, of three judges without a jury, to impose the death penalty or long imprisonment—without the right of appeal—for looting and other offenses. After strenuous opposition by members of all parties, the right of appeal was inserted for cases in which the death penalty or penal servitude of more than seven years was imposed, or for any other case the appellate tribunal should order for review.⁴⁴

Conscientious Objectors. The House of Commons on numerous occasions has discussed the status of conscientious objectors to military service and has investigated charges of injustice and maltreatment. Under the original conscription legislation, elaborate provisions were made for men who objected to being registered, to performing military service, or to undertaking combatant duties.⁴⁵ After being provisionally registered as a conscientious objector, the individual was ordered to appear for a hearing before a local tribunal, which would then place him in one of four categories. The objector could be registered unconditionally as a conscientious objector; or registered on condition that he undertake specified civil work; or be called up for noncombatant duty with the armed forces;⁴⁶ or be made subject to combatant service. Failure to fulfill the tribunal's orders, after appeal to a higher tribunal, would result in imprisonment. Similar provisions for con-

39. By February 1941, 116 Members of the House of Commons and 166 Peers were serving in the armed forces.

40. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, February 27, 1941, vol. 369, no. 31, cols. 655-735.

41. Other prominent Members of the Commons serving abroad include Sir Samuel Hoare, Ambassador to Spain; Sir Stafford Cripps, Ambassador to the Soviet Union; and Sir Ronald Cross, High Commissioner to Australia. For list of members of both Houses occupying "offices or places of profit under the Crown," see *ibid.*, cols. 769-72.

42. For discussion of some of these problems, see Green, "Britain's Wartime Economy, 1940-41," cited.

43. Emergency Powers (Defence) (No. 2) Bill, 1940. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, July 16, 1940, vol. 363, cols. 65-146. The purpose of the Bill was not to establish courts-martial, but to expedite justice in any "war zone" where dangerous conditions existed.

44. For text of the amended measure, see Emergency Powers (Defence) (No. 2) Act, 1940, *Public General Acts*, 1939-40, 3 & 4 Geo. 6, ch. 45. Provision for establishing the war zone courts was made in the Defence (War Zone Courts) Regulations, 1940. *Defence Regulations*, cited, pp. 337-48. Although the courts were set up in the spring of 1941, as a precautionary measure, they have not yet been used.

45. Military Training Act, 1939, *Public General Acts*, 1938-1939, 2 & 3 Geo. 6, ch. 25; superseded by National Service (Armed Forces) Act, 1939, *ibid.*, ch. 81.

46. Under the original statutes a conscientious objector accepting noncombatant service was transferred from the C.O. register to the military register. Under amendments in the National Service Act of 1941, however, such a person was to be retained on the C.O. register, and other minor adjustments were made. National Service Act, 1941, *Public General Acts*, 1940-41, 4 & 5 Geo. 6, ch. 15.

scientious objectors were made in later legislation for compulsory civil defense service.

By August 13, 1940 some 51,261 men had been provisionally registered as conscientious objectors; of these, 26,447 had been investigated by the local tribunals, and 12,868 had been placed conditionally or unconditionally in the C.O. register.⁴⁷ The percentage of men registering provisionally as conscientious objectors—estimated at about 47,400 in a total of over 2,800,000 by July 1940—as different age-groups are called up has steadily declined since the outbreak of war.⁴⁸ Although both the Chamberlain and Churchill governments sought to be scrupulously fair in dealing with conscientious objectors and to avoid some of the controversies which arose in the World War, several of the local tribunals and prison authorities were accused in Parliament and the press of excess patriotism and disregard of individual rights. During the months immediately preceding and following the beginning of war, when the greatest number of age groups were called up, the local tribunals in many localities were under attack on these grounds.

Internment of Aliens. The greatest controversy in the sphere of civil liberty has arisen over the Government's policy of internment of enemy aliens.⁴⁹ At the outbreak of war the Government ordered all aliens—totaling about 250,000—to be classified within three categories: A, to be interned as menacing public safety; B, to be made subject to certain restrictions of movement, but otherwise free; C, to be exempted from any restrictions. Individual hearings were to be conducted before one-man tribunals, with appeal to twelve Regional Advisory Committees for review, or ultimately to the Secretary of State for Home Security.⁵⁰ Of the 74,233 Germans and Austrians investigated by the local tribunals, only 486—less than 1 per cent of the total—were interned under Category A, while 52,882 were given permission to work, provided they did not displace British labor.⁵¹ Germany's invasion of Scandinavia, the Low Countries and France, accompanied by highly effective sabotage

and fifth-column activity, prompted the Government, however, to move from extreme leniency to extreme severity in dealing with enemy aliens. Impelled by the fear of imminent invasion, the Home Office speedily interned about 27,000 enemy aliens in the spring of 1940, including many refugees awaiting visas or quota permits for emigration to the United States and other countries.⁵² The War Office established temporary camps in many parts of Great Britain, from which the internees were to be transferred to more permanent camps on the Isle of Man. About 4,400 enemy aliens were transported to Canada and 2,200 to Australia.

This rapid shift in policy resulted in undue hardship for many enemy aliens, because of the indiscriminate treatment of "hostile" and "friendly" individuals, lack of adequate facilities at the internment camps, separation of families, and absence of adequate machinery for a rapid examination of the protests of persons interned. The Home Office, under Sir John Anderson, was subjected for several months to a storm of criticism throughout the country; and, even after Mr. Herbert Morrison became Home Secretary in August 1940 and expedited numerous reforms already under way, was continually questioned in the House of Commons.

As a result of both public pressure and the lessening of the crisis, the Home Office began to improve the internment camps, over which it had taken jurisdiction from the War Office, and to release innocent enemy aliens. Committees were established by the Home Office to deal with special categories of persons, such as scientists, musicians, and doctors. By March 1941 about 13,000 enemy aliens had been released in the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, after careful review of their cases.⁵³ About 2,000 of these aliens joined the Pioneer Corps for non-combatant work in the British Army, while hundreds of others in Canada and Australia were returned to Britain for this purpose.⁵⁴ In addition to about 5,000 infirm and invalid persons released, 350 received work in agriculture and forestry, and 270 in scientific and research work, while many others returned to posts in industry and elsewhere.

The B.B.C. One of the institutions most frequently under fire in the press and Parliament is the British Broadcasting Corporation, the semi-public body, financed by a tax on all radio sets,

47. Mr. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, September 19, 1940, vol. 365, no. 108, cols. 169-70.

48. The general ratio of men provisionally registered as C.O.'s was about 1.45 per cent, ranging from 2.1 per cent in the 21 and 22 age groups to 0.5 per cent in the 32 age group and 0.52 per cent in the 33 age group. British Library of Information, leaflet, typewritten.

49. For background, see Norman Bentwich, "England and the Aliens," *The Political Quarterly*, January-March 1941, pp. 81-93.

50. "Civilian Internees of Enemy Nationality: Categories of Persons Eligible for Release from Internment and Procedure to be Followed in Applying for Release (Revised October, 1940)," Cmd. 6223, 1940.

51. British Library of Information, *Press Release* (New York, February 22, 1940).

52. Mr. Herbert Morrison, Secretary of State for Home Security, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, December 3, 1940, vol. 367, col. 450.

53. A. P. Luscombe Whyte, *Enemies Who Help Britain* (New York, British Library of Information, May 1941, mimeographed).

54. *The New York Times*, May 16, 1941.

which owns and operates on a non-commercial basis all broadcasting stations in the United Kingdom. On many different occasions the B.B.C. has aroused controversy over the quality of its war news broadcasts and its programs designed for foreign consumption, especially in enemy countries and enemy-occupied territory.⁵⁵ In July 1941, however, the B.B.C. took the initiative in launching a "V for Victory" propaganda campaign. Introducing into its broadcasts the V-symbol of three dots and a dash in the Morse code and the opening bars of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, it urged the conquered peoples of Europe to use the V-sign wherever possible and to prepare for revolt against the Nazis.⁵⁶

The most serious controversy involving the B.B.C. arose, however, in January 1941, after several musicians and actors had been forbidden to broadcast because of their pacifist views or their participation in the anti-war People's Convention, held in London on January 12, 1941, and two technicians had been dismissed for being conscientious objectors.⁵⁷ After several of the B.B.C.'s most distinguished artists withdrew in sympathetic protest and the episode was thoroughly aired in the press, Prime Minister Churchill intervened on March 20 to announce that the Government would not exclude musical and dramatic performers from the microphone because of their political opinions, but that it would not allow anti-war speakers to broadcast.⁵⁸ Mr. Churchill declared, however, that conscientious objectors would not be permitted to undertake "highly confidential and responsible technical work" at the B.B.C. That dissatisfaction continued regarding the work of the B. B.C. was indicated by the resolution adopted on June 4, 1941 by the Labor party at its annual meeting in London, demanding Labor participation in B.B.C. administration.⁵⁹

Sir Robert Vansittart. An additional source of public controversy were the six broadcasts of Sir Robert Vansittart, Diplomatic Adviser to the Foreign Office, delivered in November 1940 and subsequently published under the title, "Black Record."⁶⁰ The Vansittart broadcasts, which contained the most virulent attacks on Germany—as

distinguished from the Nazi régime—made by any official since the outbreak of war, were condemned by numerous newspapers and magazines and censured in the House of Commons.⁶¹ While the Government disclaimed responsibility, it was assailed by many critics for permitting one of its most distinguished civil servants to comment publicly on matters of policy. Shortly after the controversy subsided, Sir Robert Vansittart retired from the Foreign Office because of age and was awarded a barony.⁶²

External Relations. With regard to external affairs, including both the problem of war aims and relations with India, Parliamentary criticism has been somewhat less effective. Not only are the issues more abstract, complex and remote than many others connected with the war effort, but information regarding them is less available to the general public. Prime Minister Churchill has consistently rejected all suggestions that he make a detailed statement of Britain's war aims, arguing that the Government is preoccupied with the military effort.⁶³ Thus far the only official pronouncements on war aims, couched in exceedingly vague terms because of the many difficult issues involved, have been the address of Lord Halifax in New York on March 25, 1941, and the statement of Foreign Secretary Eden in the House of Commons on May 29, 1941.⁶⁴

In respect of India, the Government has been equally unable or unwilling to meet the demands of its critics, and the stalemate between the Viceroy, the Congress party, and the Muslim League has continued unbroken.⁶⁵ The Labor members of the Government have apparently not pressed for further concessions to the Congress, and only on rare occasions has the Indian problem been raised in the House of Commons. In December 1940 several members of various parties—including Sir Stanley Reed, Vernon Bartlett, Colonel Josiah Wedgewood—joined in signing a letter urging a compromise settlement, but their action had no immediate results except to stimulate discussion.⁶⁶

55. For constructive criticism of the B.B.C.'s overseas services, see the speech of Philip Noel Baker (Labor), *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 25, 1941, vol. 370, no. 41, col. 541.

56. *The New York Times*, July 21, 1941.

57. *The New York Times*, December 2, 1940 and March 5, 1941.

58. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 20, 1941, vol. 370, no. 40, cols. 283-85.

59. *The Times*, June 5, 1941.

60. *The New Statesman and Nation*, December 14, 1940, pp. 609-10.

61. See, for example, the questions of Mr. Kenneth Lindsay (Liberal National) and Mr. Philip Noel Baker (Labor), *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, February 5, 1941, vol. 368, no. 21, cols. 921-22; and Viscountess Astor, *ibid.*, January 28, 1941, vol. 368, no. 17, cols. 417-18.

62. *The New York Times*, May 22, 1941.

63. For British war aims, see V. M. Dean, "Toward a New World Order," *Foreign Policy Reports*, May 1, 1941. For works suggesting a more active policy, see Harold J. Laski, *Where Do We Go From Here?* (New York, Viking, 1940); also Francis Williams, *Democracy's Battle* (New York, Viking, 1941), and *War By Revolution* (New York, Viking, 1941).

64. *The New York Times*, March 26 and May 30, 1941.

65. For background of the conflict, see J. F. Green, "India's Struggle for Independence," *Foreign Policy Reports*, July 1, 1940.

66. *The Times*, December 24, 1941.

CENSORSHIP AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

In comparison with most belligerents in both the World War and this conflict, Britain has permitted freedom of speech and assembly to a remarkable degree. Despite isolated examples of official intolerance and minor infringements of individual freedom, one American journalist has reported, "it is doubtful if there has been a single serious instance of suppression of vital civil rights."⁶⁷ The twin functions of censorship and propaganda were delegated at the outbreak of war to the Ministry of Information, while authority to suppress newspapers, forbid meetings and arrest persons suspected of hostile intent was given to the Home Office.

Until Germany's offensive in April and May, 1940, the Home Office was as lenient with British subjects as with enemy aliens. On May 23, 1940, however, the police suddenly arrested and interned Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Union of Fascists, and many of his followers; Captain Archibald H. M. Ramsay, M.P.; and John Beckett, secretary of the British Peoples' Party, allegedly an anti-Semitic group.⁶⁸ Approximately 700 members of the British Union, out of 9,000 who had paid their last annual subscription, were interned; and about 100 were released by November 1940.⁶⁹ The British Union was outlawed in July 1940 by the Home Secretary, Sir John Anderson, under Defence Regulation 18AA, which makes it a punishable offense to summon, attend, advertise or contribute to any meeting of a proscribed organization.⁷⁰ By March 1941 a total of 1,729 British subjects had been interned by the Home Secretary in accordance with his powers under Defence Regulation 18B; and of this number, 863 had been released.⁷¹ Of the remainder detained, 394 were persons of enemy origin; 133 were suspected of hostile associations or of being concerned in acts prejudicial to the defense of the realm; and 339 were members of an organization subject to foreign influence or control.

These measures, like the internment of enemy aliens, aroused public anxiety over the safeguarding of civil liberty. The internment of a Member of Parliament, Captain Ramsay, without trial, provoked a number of questions in the House of Commons, and widespread demand that in future

cases the House of Commons should receive the reasons for such action through a Committee of Privilege.⁷² Further opposition arose in Parliament over a Government proposal, introduced on March 25, 1941, to transfer British subjects and non-enemy aliens, in addition to the enemy aliens already transferred, to the Isle of Man.⁷³ Despite the arguments of several members that internment without trial was contrary to British constitutional law and that transfer to the Isle of Man made it more difficult for friends and family to visit the interned person and to protect his rights, the measure subsequently passed.

Similar action was not taken by the Government against the Communist party, which—except for a declaration at the outbreak of hostilities, later repudiated—had consistently opposed the war until Germany's invasion of the U.S.S.R. on June 22, 1941.⁷⁴ The Government not only desired to avoid "making martyrs" of the Communists, as occurred in France at the outbreak of the war, but also to avoid any unnecessary friction with the Soviet Union. It permitted the Peoples' Convention, composed of many extreme left-wing individuals and organizations, to assemble in London on January 12, 1941 and to pass resolutions urging "a peoples' peace" and friendship with the Soviet Union.⁷⁵ While the Convention claimed to represent numerous trade unions, cooperatives, and radical groups, it was formally condemned by the Trades Union Congress, the Cooperative Movement and the Labor party.⁷⁶ On January 21, 1941, however, the Home Secretary, Mr. Herbert Morrison, suppressed the Communist journal, *The Daily Worker*, and a news-letter, *The Week*, which he accused of persistent opposition to the national war effort despite warnings given in the previous spring by his predecessor, Sir John Anderson.⁷⁷ While Mr. Morrison was subsequently

72. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 4, 1941, vol. 369, no. 32, cols. 864-79.

73. Isle of Man (Detention) Act, 1941, *Public General Acts*, 4 & 5 Geo. 6, ch. 15. For discussion, see *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 25, 1941, vol. 370, no. 41, cols. 494-540. Owing to the constitutional autonomy of the Isle of Man, special legislation was necessary for the transfer of British subjects. Only 240 non-enemy aliens—of allied or neutral nationality—had been interned. *Ibid.*, col. 533.

74. *The Times*, September 2, 9, October 12, 1939; June 27, 1941.

75. *The New York Times*, January 13, 1941. The Convention also demanded a higher standard of living; adequate air raid precautions and aid to victims; safeguarding of civil liberties; nationalization of banks, transport, and large industries; freedom for India; and a "people's government."

76. For discussion of the Peoples' Convention and classification of participating organizations, see the remarks of Mr. Morrison, Home Secretary, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, January 23, 1941, vol. 368, no. 16, cols. 310-12; *The New Masses* (New York), January 28, 1940, p. 21.

77. Statement by Mr. Herbert Morrison, Home Secretary, *Par-*

67. Raymond Daniell, *The New York Times*, January 18, 1941.

68. *The New York Times*, May 24, 1941.

69. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, November 7, 1940, vol. 365, no. 123, col. 1424.

70. *The New York Times*, July 11, 1940.

71. Mr. Herbert Morrison, Secretary of State for Home Security, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, March 25, 1941, vol. 370, no. 41, cols. 529-37.

criticized in the House of Commons by several members who argued that he should have taken action through the courts rather than under his emergency powers, his action was approved by a vote of 297 to 11.⁷⁸

PARTY POLITICS

The war, by postponing a general election and requiring an "electoral truce" for by-elections, has had many repercussions on party politics in Great Britain. The life of the present House of Commons, which was due to expire in November 1940, was prolonged for another year, and—as in the World War—will be further prolonged until peacetime.⁷⁹ While it is generally agreed that the present Parliament, which still reflects the Conservative landslide of the general election of 1935, is no longer completely representative of public sentiment, there is a widespread desire to avoid any precipitate action such as the "khaki election" of 1918. Since the outbreak of war, furthermore, the three major parties, under an electoral truce, have agreed not to contest by-elections, so that each seat that becomes vacant is filled by the party previously holding it.

The effect of these necessary measures has been felt most acutely in the Labor party, which—having been the chief opposition party since the formation of the National Government in 1931—has more to gain through normal peacetime procedure and depends on constant political activity to maintain and increase its membership.⁸⁰ The participation of the Labor leaders in the Government, moreover, has made it difficult for the party's representatives in Parliament to continue effective opposition to those portions of the Government's program with which they disagree.

It is difficult to answer the larger question as to whether the participation of the Labor and Liberal parties in the coalition government has altered the actual distribution of political power. Both groups apparently entered the coalition in May 1940 without commitments and concessions, and have had

less influence on foreign and domestic policy than many of their supporters have desired. This development has been due not merely to the preoccupation of all leaders with overwhelming responsibilities and departmental duties, but also to the apparent lack of strong policy and personal influence on the part of Mr. Clement Attlee and Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Leader and Deputy-Leader respectively of the Labor party.

The Conservative party has undergone a considerable change of leadership and outlook since the war began. In forming his government on May 11, 1940, Mr. Churchill, an independent Conservative, not only created an all-party coalition, but removed many of the less popular members of the Chamberlain group—including Sir John (now Lord) Simon, Liberal National, and Sir Samuel Hoare, Conservative—from the center of power. Prime Minister Churchill, whose peerless oratory, political sagacity and knowledge of military strategy make him one of Britain's most remarkable statesmen, has remained the central personality and driving force of the whole government.⁸¹ Although the effect of wartime developments on Conservative leadership and policy will not be clearly evidenced until the next general election, there appears to be at present a trend away from the "Birmingham" group of industrial and business interests toward the younger and more progressive men surrounding Mr. Churchill, who was elected leader of the party on October 9, 1940.

In many political circles, moreover, sentiment is growing that the democratic process requires a much more competent and representative personnel in Parliament. Considerable dissatisfaction is being expressed over the excessive centralization of power in both the Conservative and Labor party machines, the rigid control exercised by the party whips over backbenchers, and the authority which the party machines have regarding the selection of candidates for elections. In the view of many observers, the House of Commons contains too many retired business men honored by the Conservative party and too many retired trade union executives honored by the Labor party. It remains to be seen whether the war and post-war period will produce younger, more able and more imaginative leaders to replace the elder statesmen of all parties who contributed to Britain's uncertain and not always successful course in the past ten years.

liamentary Debates, House of Commons, January 22, 1941, vol. 368, no. 15, cols. 185-90; *The New York Times*, January 23, 1940. For the prior warning, see *The Daily Telegraph*, July 19, 1940. The Communist party was permitted, however, to continue publication of a weekly and monthly periodical.

78. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, January 28, 1941, vol. 368, no. 17, cols. 461-532. A motion regretting Mr. Morrison's action was rejected by a vote of 323 to 6.

79. *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Commons, October 23, 1940, vol. 365, no. 119, cols. 1059-94.

80. For a recent discussion of Labor party activity and leadership, see Patricia Strauss, *Bevin and Co.* (New York, Putnam, 1941).

81. For biographies of the Prime Minister and his colleagues, see René Kraus, *Winston Churchill* (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1940), and *The Men Around Churchill* (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1941).

The September 1 issue of FOREIGN POLICY REPORTS will be
THE RESOURCES AND TRADE OF CENTRAL AMERICA

by A. Randle Elliott